

REMARKS

Interview Summary

The Applicants sincerely appreciate the courtesy extended by Examiner Hewitt during the meeting of August 7, 2003. The interview summary mailed August 12, 2003 appears accurate. The discussion included consideration of the Bezos et al. patent of record and U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314 to Payne which was brought to the applicants' attention by the Examiner during the interview.

Agreement was reached that the utilization of changing or variable verification parameters selected by the bank would be patentable as part of a combination of relevant steps for verification of internet transactions.

General Discussion of Differences and Rejections Given in Office Action

The Office Action rejected original claims 1-12 as anticipated by the patent to Bezos. The Bezos approach has a customer complete an order for goods or services at a merchant web site. The order information includes an incomplete portion of the customer credit or debit card account number.

However, the complete customer account number is communicated via

telephone at a later time. This approach is deficient in that it provides the merchant with a record that includes the customer and the customer's account number along with other information about their account. These include expiration date and in some cases the backside security code used on some charge cards. These may be provided either by touch-tone telephone keys or vocally when the telephone confirmation is made.

Numerous instances have occurred where either an errant employee or a hacker has invaded a merchant database and obtained this information. Others where employees or ex-employees have sold the information have been reported in the press.

The information communicated to the merchant in the Bezos approach is fraud enabling because the merchant makes a typical charge against the customer's account through normal charge card processing procedures. The Bezos technology also does not teach a way that allows the bank to authorize a transaction via the internet without exposing the communication via internet susceptible to interception.

These and other differences strongly indicate that the Applicant's invention is capable of addressing problems not addressed by the teachings of the Bezos patent.

Claims 1-12

Claim 1 has been amended per the interview discussions and agreement reach as indicated in the Interview Summary. Claims 2-12 are dependent from claim 1 and are also allowable.

Claim 13-25

Recites performing a verification analysis by the bank wherein the bank variably selects the verification variables used to validate the transaction. Claim 13 is believed to be patentable subject matter for at least the same reason as claim 1. There are further features which are supportive of patentability.

Claims 14-25 are dependent from claim 13 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Additional aspects of the preferred methods are

indicated and are believed to each represent a further patentable step in the claimed combination versus the prior art.

Claim 26-31

Independent claim 26 is also believed patentable. It recites a novel combination of steps. Included in this novel combination indicates that the bank inquires of the customer concerning at least one of the plurality of different verification parameters and that at least one of the verification parameters is variably selectable by the bank. Claim 26 is also believed to represent novel and non-obvious subject matter over Bezos and other art in this application.

It is believed that this application shows and the claims recite methods which are not obvious from the prior art. Methods which provide greater security in making internet transactions than shown in the prior art.

Allowance is appropriate and respectfully urged.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date:

Jan. 14, 2004


Randy A. Gregory, Reg. No. 30,386